REMARKS

Claims **1, 9-13, 15-17,** and **21-22** were amended to correct a typographical error in claim **1,** and to recite "hardware language description model" instead of "hardware model," and "software language model" instead of "software model" in claims **9-13, 15-17,** and **21-22.**

5 Applicants respectfully submit that the above-referenced claim amendments merely make explicit what was implicit in the original claims as filed, and thus the amendments are not narrowing. Independent claims **1, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33,** and **36** were amended to recite designating a set of intercore handshake connections and a set of corresponding intercore data connections. Independent claims **1, 24, 31, 32, 33,** and **36** were further amended to remove

10 the limitation that the recited cores are data-driven. Claims **34-35** were canceled. New claims **37-43** were added, and the requisite claims fee is enclosed. Following the present amendment, claims **1-33** and **36-43** are pending in the application.

Claims **9-13, 15-17,** and **21-22** were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

15 Claims **1-11, 18-22,** and **24-36** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aleksic et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,995,736), while claims **12-17** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Aleksic et al. in view of Gupte (U.S. Pat. No. 5,903,475).

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claim **23,** and for pointing

20 out the typographical error in claim **1.** The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims **9-13, 15-17,** and **21-22** were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recited

25 limitations "hardware model" and "software model." Claims **9-13, 15-17,** and **21-22** were amended to recite "hardware language description model" rather than "hardware model," and "software language model" rather than "software model." Applicants submit that claims **9-13, 15-17,** and **21-22** satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

30 ### 35 U.S.C. §102, 103

Claims **1-11, 18-22,** and **24-36** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aleksic et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,995,736), while claims **12-17** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Aleksic et al. in view of Gupte (U.S. Pat. No. 5,903,475).

09/634,131 (QUA-102)   9/26/2003

The Office Action states that Aleksic et al. describe "generating hardware description language interconnection code ('connection templates'; col. 5 li. 55-62) for interconnecting the hardware description language models to generate a hardware description language model of the circuit ('behavioral model'; col. 5, li. 19-31; fig. 1, ref. 12)."

5

Independent claims 1, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 36 recite hardware description language core interconnection code or a hardware description language model of the integrated circuit designating a set of intercore handshake connections. The intercore handshake connections may be the ready/request handshake connections recited in claim 23. Applicants respectfully
10   submit that Aleksic et al. do not describe designating a set of intercore handshake connections as recited in claims 1, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 36. Furthermore, applicants submit that Aleksic et al. do not provide a suggestion or motivation for modifying their teachings to arrive at the subject matter of the instant claims.

15   In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit the instant claims to be patentable in view of the prior art of record, and request the Examiner to indicate the allowability of the instant claims in the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,   Date: 9/26/2003
20
Andrei D. Popovici
Reg. No. 42,401

25   786 La Mesa Dr., Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel: (650) 233-1898, Fax: (650) 233-9633
Email: andrei@apatent.com

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 2 9 2003

OFFICIAL

12